

**The State Licensing Board for Residential and General Contractors met via conference call on February 20, 2007, at the Professional Licensing Boards Division in Macon, Georgia for the purpose of discussing Board business.**

**Members Present:**

**Philip Thayer, Board Vice Chairperson  
Bob Barnard  
Steve Cash  
Timothy Ansley  
Tommy Holder**

**Others Present:**

**Kyle Floyd, Executive Director  
Alison Kessler, Board Secretary  
Linda Newman, PSI Representative**

Lacking a quorum, Vice Chairperson Thayer called the meeting to order as an examination committee at 10:20 a.m.

The committee began discussion regarding reference material needed for examination.

Timothy Ansley said that the Board needed to be mindful of reciprocity in deciding what reference material would or would not be necessary.

Tommy Holder agreed with Mr. Ansley's statement by saying that the Board needed to be careful not to jeopardize reciprocity with surrounding states. Mr. Holder also stated that the Board needed to select material that would be relevant to the protection of the public.

Kyle Floyd, Executive Director, added that all Board members needed to suggest individuals to serve as subject matter experts (SMEs) for test development.

Mr. Floyd also updated the members present that Senate Bill 171 had been introduced in the General Assembly. The bill proposes to repeal the Residential and General Contractors Board. Mr. Floyd further stated that members present needed to inform other Board members of this Senate Bill and all members needed to read the proposed legislation as well as Senate Bill 115. The Board needs to be knowledgeable of the bill so that the Board can vote as to its position on the bill.

Mr. Floyd updated the members present about the responses he had received regarding the registration for specialty contractors since the February 14, 2007 Board meeting. Mr. Floyd stated that he had been receiving "mixed responses" regarding the suggestion that the Board made at the February 14, 2007 Board meeting regarding the registration of specialty contractors.

Mr. Floyd went on to update members present about the extension of the effective date for licensure. Mr. Floyd explained that it was brought to his attention that it might be just as well to extend the effective date one year as opposed to the six months the Board voted to approve.

Timothy Ansley responded to Mr. Floyd by saying that they as a Board "made a commitment and they needed to honor that commitment."

Bob Barnard responded by saying that "every time you move the date, you send out the signal that you (the Board) don't know what you're doing. So if the extension should be a year, make it a year and not six months."

Tommy Holder added that he would like to revisit the possibility of having Board staff approve General Contractors for licensure by examination exemption.

Mr. Floyd responded to Mr. Holder's suggestion by saying that giving his staff authority to approve applicants for licensure is not going to ease the burden of the number of applications pending review. Mr. Floyd went on to say that the reason this would not ease the number of applications pending review is due to the fact that either way, application specialists have to work the entire application.

Mr. Holder asked Mr. Floyd how many applications he was anticipating for examination.

Bob Barnard interjected that there is no way of knowing such a number; rather, you have to be prepared for the same amount of applications received through examination exemption, if not more.

Mr. Holder responded to Mr. Barnard's comment by saying that he understood the opinion, but it would be better to extend the effective date of licensure than to be ill-prepared for the issuance of licenses.

At 10:45 a.m., Psychological Services, Inc. (PSI) Representative, Linda Newman, joined the conference call.

Ms. Newman began the conversation by stating the suggested list of non-code texts provided to Board members for inclusion in examination content were based on a minimum model. In regards to the materials needed for the examination, using only code books would be too minimal. Ms. Newman went on to say, "You need to show minimum competency. The books need to be good reference books that are the basic domain of both Residential Basic and General Contractor work. The recommended reference material books are going to be very useful. I would feel that these books would establish the minimum competency. These books are the least expensive and the most important."

The members present questioned Ms. Newman about reciprocity and whether the texts listed would allow for reciprocation with surrounding states.

Ms. Newman replied, "These books would absolutely be reciprocal with other states."

Ms. Newman reiterated that two things are needed before her company could proceed with the examination. First, does the Board approve the list of non-code texts? And, if so, will they allow flexibility for SMEs in the examination review committees to change and replace texts if necessary? Second, PSI needs names and contact information for subject matter experts.

Kyle Floyd reminded Ms. Newman that because the Board could not establish a quorum, members present were meeting as a committee and no official action could be taken at this juncture.

Mr. Floyd asked Ms. Newman to clarify the criteria for subject matter experts (SMEs). Ms. Newman responded to Mr. Floyd's request by stating that a balance between Board members and others in the industry needs to be achieved. Ms. Newman went on to state that SMEs could be comprised of board members, professors of construction subjects, experts in the field who had already been approved for licensure, building officials, or any other individual who had significant experience in this industry who will not be taking the examination. Ms. Newman went on to say that professors or other persons not interested in taking the examination are requested to sign a waiver if selected as a SME, swearing they would not teach preparation courses or any other courses surrounding this examination.

Mr. Floyd asked Ms. Newman if some type of waiver would be required for association members that were selected as potential SMEs but who have no interest in taking the examination.

Ms. Newman responded to Mr. Floyd's question by saying, "it may be in the best interest of the examination to avoid inviting association members."

Ms. Newman informed the members present that PSI did all of the work in regards to contracting the SMEs recommended and inviting them to the ERCs.

Ms. Newman said that there were two preliminary schedules that had been established for the SMEs to meet and conduct business:

One schedule had two separate examination committees meeting concurrently with 10 to 12 SMEs and for a time span of two to three days.

The second schedule was a three day session with six to ten SMEs followed by another meeting two weeks later.

Ms. Newman clarified that the schedule chosen is dependent upon how many SMEs you have.

The members presented inquired how the SMEs would be compensated.

Ms. Newman said that PSI typically pays per diem but she was not prepared to speak about compensation. It would be in the contract for services.

Mr. Floyd again told members present that he needed them to forward potential SMEs to his attention in order for PSI to move forward.

Ms. Newman also asked the members present to consider where they wanted the exam review committee (ERC) to meet. She suggested state offices or conference centers as a possibility. Ms. Newman further stated the importance of such information in order for potential SMEs to make a commitment.

At 11:20 a.m., Tommy Holder left the conference call.

The remaining members present asked Ms. Newman when a realistic time was for the examination to be ready for administration.

Ms. Newman said that May 1, 2007 looks very realistic for examination administration, so long as the before mentioned schedule is kept.

With no other business for the members to discuss with Ms. Newman regarding the examination, Ms. Newman left the conference call at 11:25 a.m.

Mr. Floyd explained to the members present that another conference call would need to be scheduled for the Board to take official action regarding the examination. The remaining members present committed to a conference call on Thursday, February 22 at 2:00 p.m.

With no other business for the committee to discuss, the conference call ended at 11:26 a.m.

Minutes recorded by:

Alison Kessler, Board Secretary

Minutes reviewed/edited by:

Kyle Floyd, Executive Director